DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 397 SO 015 910

TITLE	So You Have Agreed to Help...A Resource Guide for Lawyers to Help Solicit Funds for Local Law-Related Education Projects.
INSTITUTION	Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity International, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
PUB DATE	Aug 81
GRANT	79-JN-AX-0011
NOTE	21p.; For related resource guides, see SO 015 909-911.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Citizenship Education; Community Services; *Community Support; Donors; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Support; *Fund Raising; Lawyers; *Legal Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Law Related Education

ABSTRACT

This guide provides assistance to the lawyer who has volunteered to help a law-related education project by soliciting supplementary funds from local business, civic, or other sources. Specifically, the guide offers guidance in identifying and approaching potential donors, preparing the request for funds, and organizing supporting data and follow-up information. The solicitation process has been streamlined to allow the busy lawyer to secure the necessary funds with a minimum expenditure of time. Following an introduction, the first of four main sections assists readers in understanding the nature and scope of potential projects. The second section suggests ways of locating funds from corporations, labor organizations, private foundations, banks, community service and professional organizations, and individuals. The third section offers methods of solicitation. Finally, the guide stresses the need for follow-up activities to inform donors of how their funds were used. The first of two appendices provides statistics, facts, and findings that show why schoolchildren need to know more about law, the legal process, and the legal system, for those trying to build a case for law-related education when soliciting funds. A second appendix provides a sample letter of solicitation. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED255397

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert E. Redding

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

So You Have Agreed to Help . . .

A Resource Guide for Lawyers to Help Solicit Funds for Local Law-Related Education Projects

50 015 910

A publication of the

Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity, International

Juvenile Justice Office

So You Have Agreed to Help . . .

A Resource Guide for Lawyers to Help Solicit Funds for Local Law-Related Education Projects

This project is supported by Grant No. 79-JN-AX-0011 awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Department of Justice. The contents do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of this grantor agency.

Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity, International, August 1981.

© Copyright 1981. All rights are reserved, except that any part of this publication may be reproduced in any manner without the written permission of the publisher, provided that credit is given to the publisher for its availability.

Published in Washington, D.C., United States of America.

Library of Congress Catalogue Card No. 81-81499.

Price: $3.00

Published by: Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity, International
August, 1981

Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity, International
Juvenile Justice Office
910 17th Street, N.W., Suite 310
Washington, D.C. 20006

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Preface 1

I. **Introduction** 2

Purpose of this resource guide.
What is law-related education?
Why we need local funding help.
Lawyers are well-suited to help.

II. **Know Your Program** 4

Be prepared to explain the basic objectives of the program.
Be specific about who will benefit from the program.
Know how much money is needed and how it will be spent.
Obtain a "Program Description and Budget Summary."

III. **Locating Funds in Your Community** 6

Corporations.
Labor organizations.
Private foundations.
Banks.
Community service and professional organizations.
Individuals.

IV. **Methods of Solicitation** 8

Planning your approach.
Contacting the potential donor.

V. **Follow-Through Activities** 10

Appendices

A. Here's What You'll Need to Make the Case 11

B. Sample Letter of Solicitation 16

Preface

As a lawyer and supporter of law-related education, you have been asked to solicit funds to help a law-related education project in your local community — a program sponsored by a Phi Alpha Delta alumni or law school chapter, for example — to teach young people their rights and responsibilities under the law. Most likely, you were approached by the local PAD coordinator or, in the case of a project sponsored by an educational institution, the project director.

This Resource Guide was developed by the Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity, International with funds provided by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice. Since February, 1979, the Fraternity has carried out a very active and cooperative program in law-related education.

The purpose of this guide is to assist alumni members of the Fraternity, as well as other interested community lawyers, in raising funds to assist local law-related programs. The Guide is offered because of the need to develop supplementary local funding for this vitally important educational activity.

The Guide was written by Linda Riekes, Director of the St. Louis Public Schools' Law and Education Project, and Calla Smorodin, Coordinator of the Urban Consumer Project. Special thanks are due to Carolyn Carter who diligently typed and retyped this Guide.

A special Task Force was formed by the Fraternity to assist in the development of this Guide. Its members included James A. Borchers, past Deputy Director of the Phi Alpha Delta Juvenile Justice Office; Stanley H. Kohn, Second International Vice Justice of Phi Alpha Delta; Roger D. Sandack, Attorney and immediate past Chairman of Utah Commission on Education for Law and Citizenship; and Charles J. White, III, Assistant Staff Director of the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship (YEFC).

We have sought and received helpful comments and recommendations from many experts in the LRE field. They include such persons as Isidore Starr (YEFC member) and David M. Schimmel (immediate past Director of the Massachusetts Association for Law-Related Education and Education Consultant to the Fraternity).

In addition, useful suggestions have been received from Carolyn Pereira, Constitutional Rights Foundation; Jane Sure and Alita Letwin, Law In A Free Society; and Richard Roe, National Street Law Institute.

The contents of this Guide have been copyrighted. We are glad, however, to authorize the reproduction of any part of the publication without written permission, provided that the reproduction will be used for non-profit purposes and that credit is given to the Fraternity for its availability.

We hope that this new publication will provide professional assistance to all persons choosing to use it and will strengthen the nation-wide law-related education movement. We welcome all comments and suggestions for improvement.

Robert E. Redding, Director
Juvenile Justice Office
Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity, International

I. Introduction

Purpose of this resource guide.

This Guide provides assistance to the lawyer who has volunteered to help a law-related education project by soliciting supplementary funds from local business, civic, or other sources. Specifically, the Guide offers guidance in identifying and approaching potential donors, preparing the request for funds, and organizing supporting data and follow-up information. The solicitation process has been streamlined to allow the busy lawyer to secure the necessary funds with a minimum expenditure of time.

This Guide is divided into four main sections. First, this Guide will assist you in understanding the nature and scope of your project. Second, it will suggest ways to locate funds in your community, and third, it will offer some methods of solicitation. Finally, this Guide will stress the need for follow-up activities to inform donors of how their funds were used.

Two appendices have been included to assist you. Appendix A contains sample statements to help you make your case for law-related education. Appendix B contains a sample letter of solicitation.

What is law-related education?

The idea of law-related education (LRE) is relatively new. The LRE movement began as a response to alarming reports in the 1960's that citizenship education had failed to generate in students an interest in our country's political and legal systems. As an education discipline, it is perhaps best defined by the American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship, as follows:

> Law-related education seeks to improve the citizenship education of American youngsters by teaching them about law, the legal process, and the legal system. It attempts to give them another way of understanding our society and some tools with which they can constructively participate in the making and shaping of laws. . . .
>
> Law-related education seeks to build skills, improve understanding, and create constructive attitudes. The focus may be on such applied skills as how to read a contract and how to be a wiser consumer, or on such broad skills as analytical thinking, value analysis, the ability to persuade others, and the ability to reach decisions after having identified issues and weighed evidence. In trying to improve understanding, it seeks to provide a perspective on the clash of interests within society and the role of law in structuring society. Law-related education courses often examine such questions as the origins and purposes of law, alternatives to law and conventional legal processes, and limitations of law. In pursuing skill development, improved understanding and inculcation of constructive attitudes, law-related education aims to prepare students to be knowledgeable, concerned, and active citizens.[1]

Over the last decade, citizenship values and ideals have been effectively taught through the study of law and the legal process in hundreds of programs across the country. While the specific programs are as varied as the communities they serve, there is an important unifying theme. The federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) in the Department of Justice expresses it aptly:

> Law-related education encompasses many different programs and many different approaches to teaching about law and the justice system. But all programs have in common the goal of demystifying the law, giving citizens the tools they'll need to constructively shape and use it. And in all programs, broad-based community involvement helps begin and strengthen law-related education.[2]

Law-related education exposes young people to a wide range of opportunities, enabling them to develop skills for effective participation as responsible citizens.

Why we need local funding help.

In 1975, America paid $500 million for school vandalism; in 1979, it cost New York State alone $1.4 billion to operate its law enforcement agencies. Yet governmental funding sources available to assist local educators in designing and implementing

---

[1] *Mandate for Change: The Impact of Law Educational Innovation,* American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship, 1980. This Special Committee has provided important national leadership for more than 10 years in helping to establish an effective law-related education movement in the United States.

[2] *Alternatives to Apathy: Law-Related Education Programs for Young People,* Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1980.

LRE projects are limited. Typically, a law-related education project, whether in a school system, university, state department of education, or bar association, receives a minimum level of funding from a federal, state, or local agency. The project will invariably require additional support to fund activities which supplement the basic project and enhance its effectiveness.

Examples of these supplemental activities and the manner in which they directly affect people include the following:

(1) assisting teachers with stipends for law-related education summer institutes and graduate courses;

(2) sponsoring awareness sessions for teachers and law-related resource people;

(3) providing buses for law-related field trips;

(4) underwriting the costs of producing a law-related newsletter for parents and community;

(5) purchasing law-related materials for project classes;

(6) assisting with mock trial competitions, such as the cost of reproducing materials, prizes, buses to competition sites, and banquet or luncheon; and

(7) underwriting costs of providing a national resource person to offer assistance to teachers and school administrators developing local law-related education programs.

Lawyers are well-suited to help.

Lawyers are usually involved as community leaders in a wide range of public service projects and, as such, they are in a unique position to solicit funds from local business, civic, labor, professional and philanthropic organizations. Lawyers can bolster local law-related education projects by providing fund-raising assistance. This, in turn, will help in the adoption, implementation and institutionalization of law-related education in local schools.

A lawyer who makes the effort to contact business, civic, or other community leaders on behalf of a law-related project is actively demonstrating a personal belief in the worth of the project. This commitment is readily communicated to a potential donor, and carries with it a very persuasive quality. Donors are often impressed by vigorous support of law-related education by members of the legal profession, and they generally are receptive to such well-presented appeals for funds.

It is anticipated that the users of this Guide will not seek funding in excess of $5,000; however, the principles and procedures set out in this publication are also applicable to the solicitation of larger amounts. If you are interested in securing grants from government sources, we suggest that you contact the American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship, 1155 East 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60637, telephone (312) 947-3960.

II. Know Your Program

Soliciting funds is basically a selling job. Like any sales operation, the first step is to know your product. Although your goal is to secure funding for *supplemental activities*, it is important that you also know about the basic LRE project in your community. This information will provide essential background for the activities you are seeking to fund.

To avoid confusion, this manual will use the word, "project" to refer to the basic LRE project. "Program" will refer to activities which supplement the basic LRE project.

In essence, you are trying to "sell" a program to a customer; that is, a donor who will provide the needed funds. Therefore, before you approach a possible donor, you should have a clear idea of exactly what you are selling, why it is needed, who will benefit, and how much it costs. You are more likely to get a positive response if you know your program and present a convincing need for the funds.

Knowing your program also means knowing about funds, services, and in-kind contributions that are being provided to the project by other sources, such as the LRE's host institution, other professional associations, corporations, etc.

Be prepared to explain the basic objectives of the program.

It will strengthen your selling position to know how the proposed program will expand and enrich the goals of the LRE project. For example, you could explain that a class visit to a court in session would reinforce important LRE principles taught in the classroom by enabling students to witness the justice system at work. Your contact person in the LRE project is an important source of information on the educational goals of the LRE project.

Be specific about who will benefit from the proposed program.

In soliciting funds, it is important to state the identity and number of people who will participate in the program. For example, 150 students enrolled in high school law classes. It is also important to communicate not only how the participants will benefit personally, but also the kind of community impact the program is likely to have. Participation in a mock trial competition, for example, may involve only 100 young people, yet the experience will leave a lasting impression on each of them, their parents, friends, teachers, classmates, school administrators and others.

Another successful technique is to discuss the indirect benefits from the direct involvement of the participants. For example, a law-related institute for 40 secondary teachers may indirectly serve a minimum of 1,200 students (allowing for one LRE class per teacher, each containing 30 students). The involvement of support agencies, e.g., police, juvenile authorities, and the courts, will affect hundreds of people.

Know how much money is needed and how it will be spent.

Always inform potential donors how their funds are to be used. This will give them the satisfaction of knowing that they are responsible for providing stipends, purchasing student awards, funding local scholarships, hiring buses, or perhaps providing refreshments for a large public meeting. In addition, some benefactors are better able to donate in-kind services than cash. For example, a large company with its own in-house printing operation may prefer to donate paper and printing than have to go through the approval procedure for cash. Stamps, cooperative publicity, food, and even door prizes for charitable fund-raising are other examples of in-kind contributions.

Obtain a "Program Description and Budget Summary."

The Program Description and Budget Summary (hereinafter called the Program Description) is the most important source of information for donors. It should briefly describe the program and emphasize the supplementary activities which require funding. Consisting of no more than two or three single-spaced typewritten pages, it should be written clearly and provide answers to the following questions.

(1) What will the program accomplish?

(2) What activities will take place?

(3) Who will participate?

(4) Who will benefit?

(5) When will the program take place?

(6) Why is it necessary to approach donors for supplementary assistance?

(7) How will funds be used?

(8) Who are the key people in the program?

(9) Who is responsible for carrying it out?

(10) How does this program fit into the overall LRE project?

(11) What funds, services, and in-kind contributions will be provided by other sources?

You should not have to write the Program Description yourself. Your contact person in the LRE project is responsible for giving you this information in writing.

III. Locating Funds In Your Community

There is a great incentive for businesses and other organizations to provide financial support to worthwhile local projects. For a minimum dollar expenditure, the benefactor can receive invaluable benefits in goodwill. A city of medium size has a wealth of potential donors — corporations, foundations, service organizations, professional groups, civic and church groups, labor organizations, banks, and individuals. Before knocking on the first door, however, take some time to do some preliminary research.

We suggest that you begin with people you know, colleagues, associates, fraternity members, classmates, friends. Often, it is through personal contacts that much information gets transmitted about small-scale philanthropic activities. For example, if you happen to know a corporation's General Counsel, this can be an excellent way to ascertain that company's policies on contributing money to worthy causes, how much it gives to small programs, and what kinds of activities it is likely to support. Similarly, colleagues active in service organizations such as the Kiwanis and Rotary Clubs, can be valuable sources of information about getting support from their organizations. Do not overlook your own membership in professional organizations, such as Phi Alpha Delta, and state and local bar associations.

Your search for potential donors will depend a great deal upon the resources available in your community and the pattern of philanthropic giving which already exists. There are some funding approaches, however, which we recommend as having general application to most communities.

Corporations.

In recent years, corporations have become increasingly active in philanthropic giving. A report from the Conference Board, a national non-profit business research organization, shows that over the three-year period 1977 to 1980, corporate giving increased an average of 16 percent annually, faster than giving by any other sector of society. In 1979, corporate contributions were estimated at $2.3 billion. Nevertheless, business still remains a relatively untapped source of philanthropic support. Of the total number of United States corporations, only about 25 percent make cash contributions, and only 6 percent contribute more than $500 per year. In 1978, corporations provided only 5 percent of the nation's total charitable contributions of $39.6 billion. Nearly half of the value of all corporate philanthropic gifts come from fewer than 1,000 companies. Thus, local corporations can be an excellent source of funds.

Large corporations usually have stated policies about philanthropic activity. Often, these companies will designate one person to handle all requests for local donations. We suggest a preliminary conversation with this person to ascertain the company's policy on providing funds to projects.

First, find out whether the company is receptive to your LRE project. You can do this by describing briefly the activity for which you are seeking funds and then inquiring whether the project appears to be within the scope of activities the company is willing to fund. In this discussion, seek as much clarification as possible about the kinds of programs the company is looking for and what programs have been funded in the past.

Be sure to find out the dollar limit beyond which approval must be given by a corporate Board of Directors. In many companies, the person in charge of corporate giving has sole discretion in granting funds *below* this dollar limit. Find out whether requests for funds are to be made at certain specified times of the year or whether they will be accepted at any time.

It is particularly important to pay close attention to all of the criteria that are set out; later, this can help you package your funding request. One company, for example, may want to help deserving, needy youngsters; another, to stop crime in the streets. Later, when you make your solicitation for funds, this information will help you focus your appeal in a way that emphasizes benefits to the donor.

An alternative you may want to consider is to acquire much of this information on your own so that when you ultimately present your project to the person in charge of giving, you can be sure it will fit within the guidelines. It may be more time-efficient in the long run, for example, to speak first with someone else in the company about funding policy. Another good source of information about a company's community interest is its annual report. Also, in some communities, business associations publish newsletters which may include this kind of information.

Smaller corporations generally are less structured in terms of their philanthropic activities. How-

ever, because they are smaller, they usually reflect the personal philosophies of their principals. This is particularly true of closely held, family corporations.

Labor organizations.

Labor organizations are generally helpful with various charitable activities in the local community. An employee organization is valuable as a resource of funding because it represents individuals. It is the *members* of labor unions, however, who are your source of funds. The union may serve as a channel by permitting you to solicit through its newsletter or newspaper, post requests at union hiring halls, or make a direct request at a membership meeting. A member of the union — a parent of a child in your project perhaps — may be willing to request funds for you or sponsor an introduction for a personal presentation.

Be aware that support from labor organizations carries with it an expectation that certain courtesies be observed. Funds should not be used to contract for services from non-union companies. For example, if you were raising funds for printing costs, print your product with the union label or "bug" unless it clearly designates "printed by volunteers" or "printing donated."

Private foundations.

Numerous private foundations have been established to serve many worthy purposes. The larger foundations are listed in the Foundation Directory (published by the Foundation Center, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10106). This directory includes a listing of thousands of foundations, their purposes and funding priorities, assets and other financial data, names and addresses of officers, and information about submitting requests for funding. A copy should be available at your local library. There are many local and regional foundations, however, which are particularly interested in local and regional projects. Rely on your local contacts to find out about smaller foundations. In some communities there are clearinghouse sources which provide information about small foundations active in the local area. Your most important source may be your contact at a bank or trust company, because many trust officers act as trustees of these foundations.

Banks.

Banks can be a good source of financial support if you have something tangible to sell — tickets to a fund raising dinner, for example. Also, they often are willing sponsors of events. In addition, personnel from bank trust departments frequently serve on the board of trustees of private foundations and are well aware of the requirements of each foundation. A call to the appropriate trust officer will generally produce valuable information; e.g., dates of annual meetings, amounts of donations given, and type of project support by the foundation.

Community service and professional organizations.

In any given community, there are a variety of organizations that may be willing to fund a small program. These include churches, lodges, bar associations, service groups, exchange clubs, chambers of commerce, and business associations. A call to one of their members or executive directors can usually produce the desired information concerning preferred charities and public service projects.

Generally, it helps if you are a member of the organization you solicit. A second best alternative is to get help from a colleague who is a member. Be prepared to make a brief speech about your project at a membership or executive board meeting.

Professional legal organizations and bar associations are an excellent source of fundings for assisting law-related activities. Phi Alpha Delta strongly urges local bar associations to participate in law-related education projects. Auxiliary associations, such as lawyers' spouses, are also a good source of funding. You may be able to persuade members of these groups to organize a special fund-raising event for your project.

Individuals.

We also suggest that you not overlook the possibility of individual donors to underwrite your projects. It has been reported, for example, that in 1978 nearly 90 percent of the nation's total charitable contributions came from individuals. Many local citizens would welcome an opportunity to assist worthwhile local projects, and should be attracted to your proposal to help young people in the community.

In summary, your strategy for soliciting funds in your community will depend a great deal on local custom and available resources. There is, however, one overriding concept that has great relevance to soliciting funds. It is crucial, whether seeking funds from a large corporation or a small law firm, to know something about a potential donor before making your requests for funds. All philanthropic givers will expect you to be aware of their history of assisting worthy causes. All of them will be appreciative of the recognition you give to their efforts. And, all of them will be more receptive to your request if you can relate your project's activities to an area of interest to which they are already committed.

IV. Methods Of Solicitation

At this point, we have discussed the importance of your having a thorough knowledge of your program, why it is needed, who will benefit, and how much it costs. You should also know something about the funding prospect you have selected — past history, funding interests, available funds, procedures for application, and the personnel involved. It is now time to discuss your strategies for approaching the potential donor.

Planning your approach.

Planning is very important to preparing an effective appeal for funds. As you plan your approach, keep in mind that your job is to persuade the donor to fund your program because it is worthy — by the donor's own standards and criteria. This is a crucial point. Your donor is asking, "Why should *I* fund this program?" It is not enough to explain why the program is important to you; you must also explain why the program is important to the donor.

The first step in your strategy, then, is to emphasize the program's merits from the donor's point of view. Since priorities of donors vary, your appeal should highlight those aspects of the program in which the donor has a particular interest.

As you prepare for a discussion of the benefits of the program, you may find it helpful to draw upon a rationale which explains the need for law-related education and sets out arguments for supporting local LRE projects. Appendix A, entitled, "Here's What You'll Need to Make the Case," includes some of the statistics, facts, and findings that show why students need to know more about law, the legal process, and our legal system. The information in this appendix is divided into the following general categories:

- voting and citizenship education;
- prevention of juvenile delinquency and youth crime; and
- developing public confidence in the legal profession and legal processes.

If your potential donor has an interest in voting and citizenship information, for example, you may begin your approach with a discussion of the need for this information in your community and how law-related education attempts to address this need. If a business is located in a high crime area, you may find it more useful to refer to juvenile crime statistics and to explain how your project will increase respect for the property of others. Please read Appendix A now.

A second step in planning your approach is to emphasize how contributing to your program will confer special benefits on the donor. For example, factory owners in a small town may find it beneficial to donate funds to a program that reaches students of their employees.

Contacting the potential donor.

There are three ways to make your initial contact with the potential donor: in person, by telephone, or by letter. Based on what you know about the potential donor, you should determine which of these will be the most feasible. If at all possible, try to set up a personal meeting. You may be able to secure an introduction to the potential donor through one of your personal contacts. Preferably, your contact will arrange a meeting at which you will be introduced. You may decide to provide the potential donor with some preliminary information in advance of the meeting.

Whether your initial contact is in person, by telephone, or by letter, you should supply the potential donor with a copy of the Program Description and a letter of solicitation. These should be sent as a follow-up to a personal meeting.

The solicitation letter should be brief (no more than two pages), informative, and typed on your personal letterhead. Its purpose is to state your request in writing and to persuade the donor to fund your project. The letter's content will be based on your plan of approach and will reflect your knowledge of the program and your knowledge of the donor's funding priorities.

In many cases, a potential donor will respond favorably to a program which is deemed worthwhile by prominent people in the community. In your letter, you may wish to refer to these persons by name or to supply letters of endorsement.

Letters of solicitation come in many styles and varieties. There is no particular type of letter that is better than any other. Appendix B contains a sample letter of solicitation we have found to be successful in generating funds. This letter can be adapted for the initial contact or for following up a personal meeting or telephone conversation.

Hopefully, your solicitation for funds will be met with interest and you will be asked to discuss your program's funding needs with the potential donor. Listen carefully for possible funding concerns and be flexible enough to consider alternative ways of negotiating with the donor if it appears that you will not receive your requested dollar amount.

You may find a donor who is enthusiastic about your program, but who will underwrite only a portion of the funding request. Sometimes a donor may be willing to give cash or in-kind contributions only if others in the community are willing to do the same. In this case, you can ask your donor for a pledge to match the contribution of others. Such a pledge gives you great leverage in securing funds or in-kind contributions from other donors. Try to get your donor to assist you in locating and contacting other donors.

Bear in mind that the potential donor will likely give consideration to the tax implications of making a contribution, such as claiming a deduction on federal income tax returns. We suggest that you be familiar with such implications and discuss them openly with the potential donor.

Finally, do not give up if your first effort fails to produce funding. Move on to another potential donor and present your case again. Persistence pays off.

V. Follow-Through Activities

Once you have secured funds or an in-kind contribution, remember that the donor is buying a product and, in some cases, recognition. Therefore, be sure there is a follow-up plan to let the donor know what was done with the funds. The plan should be simple; but because it is simple, it is important that it not be overlooked. The donor should receive in writing a list of activities that took place as a result of the funded program.

Follow-through activities should always include a thank-you letter from you and from the project director. This could be supplemented by an attractive plaque with a suitable inscription, such as "Whitslock Manufacturing Company — 1981 Sponsor — Wright School Mock Court Demonstration."

If the project publishes a newsletter, perhaps a brief article about the program could appear in one issue. If so, sending a copy to the donor is a good follow-through. If the donor has provided funding for a large public meeting, a copy of the agenda should be furnished, along with any press anouncements or news coverage.

Some project directors routinely issue certificates of appreciation to donors. Others take photographs of the program in action and include them in an end-of-program report. Another good way to inform donors about the program is to invite them to major events. Donors who attend mock trial competitions, for example, can witness first-hand the exciting learning experience made possible with the help of their gifts.

Some donors want public recognition of their gift; others prefer a low profile approach. The follow-through should be consistent with the donor's wishes. Any kind of printing — program announcements, brochures, booklets — is ideal for supplying public, and lasting recognition of a donor's support. Another way to give public recognition is to include the donor's name in the title of the program. A program to pay expenses for students to attend a competition could be labeled "The Wood Scholarship." Similarly, a summer program for teachers can be called "The Ryan Summer Institute."

Some follow-through activities may be *required* by the donor; however, even in the absence of required follow-through, attention should be paid to this important aspect of soliciting funds. Besides being a courtesy to those who have contributed, the follow-through activities may yield an added payoff. As donors in your local community learn more about your program and law-related education generally, they will develop their own commitment and loyalty to the program they have funded. This will help law-related education grow and become an important — and ongoing — effort in your community.

Appendix A

Here's what you'll need to make the case

This appendix includes some of the statistics, facts, and findings that show why schoolchildren need to know more about law, the legal process, and our legal system. Some of this information is in the form of short, descriptive paragraphs; others are more fully-developed discussions. They can be used singly or in combination to help you build support for your program. You may want to add some local information to underscore the need for law-related education in your community.

Voting and citizenship information.

During the first half of the 1970s, U.S. teenagers:

- showed declines in their knowledge of the structure and function of government;
- lost ground in their understanding of and willingness to participate in the political process;
- showed some declines in recognizing and valuing constitutional rights.

These are among major findings reported by the National Assessment of Educational Progress which is funded by the National Center for Education Statistics.

The 1976 study was contrasted with an earlier study conducted in 1969. It found that the ability to explain the basic concept of democracy had declined 12 percentage points (from 86 percent to 74 percent) for 17-year-olds and 11 percentage points (from 53 percent to 42 percent) for 13-year-olds. Also, while nearly all the students in both assessments could name the President of the United States, only about one-fifth of the 13-year-olds in either assessment successfully identified at least one of their congressional representatives. In the 1976 survey, slightly less than one-half of the 17-year-olds could name either their congressperson or one of their senators, a decline of 9 percentage points from the first study.

Although the second assessment of citizenship and social studies was conducted during a presidential election year, considerable uncertainty existed about how presidential candidates are selected: On one item measuring such knowledge, 17-year-olds' performance showed a sharp 14 percentage-point decline, from 50 percent to 36 percent.

The National Assessment also found that knowledge of local government dropped. Approximately 70 percent of the 17-year-olds identified their state's governor in 1976, a decline of 13 percentage points from 1969. When asked about a state assembly, only 55 percent in 1976 identified it as belonging to the legislative branch of government, a decline of 24 percentage points from 1969. A substantial 22 percent in 1976 replied "I don't know" to the question. The percentage of students feeling that they could influence their local government also declined from 1969 to 1976.

According to a political scientist who analyzed young people's knowledge of the U.S. Constitution:

> Knowledge of constitutional rights also declined slightly from the first to the second assessment. Approximately three-fifths of the 13-year-olds and four-fifths of the 17-year-olds in the 1976 assessment realized that their civil rights are stated in the U.S. Constitution. This represented a drop of 4 percentage points for both the 13- and 17-year-olds. But many fewer in each group *value* such rights. Only 49 percent of 13-year-olds would allow a person who did not believe in God to hold a public office; barely half would allow a magazine or a newspaper to publish criticism of an elected official. On the whole, students' total performance levels were slightly less positive in 1975-76 than they had been a few years earlier.[1]
>
> Performance on one item, concerning the rights of the accused, improved by 20 percentage points for 13-year-olds. According to the report, explanations for the change can only be suppositions, but a marked increase in statewide citizenship and law-related education projects may have contributed to the improvement.
>
> The generally disappointing citizenship findings are corroborated by voting statistics. The Census Bureau reports that in the 1970s, 18- to 20-year-olds voted less frequently than any other age group. In one national election, for example, 58 percent of the 55-64-year-old age group had voted, while a dismal 21 percent of the youngest voters had actually voted.
>
> —*American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship, 1981.*

[1]Karen Smith Dawson, "What Youth Know and Believe About the Constitution," presented at the Project '87 Conference on Teaching About the Constitution in American Secondary Schools, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, October, 1980.

It is no exaggeration to say that this nation is currently facing a crisis of citizenship. Alienation, apathy, frustration, and even violence have increased markedly among our citizens, and indices of antisocial behavior, such as the crime rate, are rising steadily. At the same time, public confidence and citizen participation in government are declining. Many thoughtful observers have questioned whether a democracy can long endure in this atmosphere of mistrust and cynicism.

Meanwhile, public school courses in citizenship — historically designed to produce an informed and concerned citizenry — have come under increasing scrutiny and have all too often been found wanting. A number of scholarly studies have demonstrated that students are alienated both by the method of learning and by the content of traditional courses in civics and government. In 1971, for example, the American Political Science Association reported that such courses presented a "naive, romanticized approach . . . which confused the ideals of democracy with the realities of politics." The APSA found that the schools failed to develop in students "an understanding of the capacities and skills needed to participate effectively and democratically."

—American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship, 1981.

Prevention of juvenile delinquency and youth crime

In October 1979, the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention/Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention provided a grant to the Social Science Education Consortium and the Center for Action Research, both of Boulder, Colorado, to establish the Law Related Education Evaluation Project. The purpose of the project was to assess the activities of six programs supported by OJJDP to further the development of law related education nationally. During the first year of the effort, assessment research was concerned with documenting and assessing the quality and effectiveness of activities to expand the awareness, adoption, implementation, and institutionalization of law related education in schools in communities across the nation. Further, during 1980, the Law Related Education Evaluation Project designed and tested instruments which could be used to gather data from students in LRE and non-LRE classrooms for assessing the effectiveness of classroom implementation of LRE. Of concern was the extent to which the educational development theory which underlies law related education was operationalized in practical application in the classroom and to measure the impact of application on levels of student knowledge, attitudes, and behavior in and out of the classroom.

During the spring of 1981, data were gathered from ten different LRE classrooms and a like number of control classrooms in six different communities (ranging in population from 3,000 persons to more than 650,000).

Included in those factors are: improvement in attitudes toward the law, bonding to education and the school, reduced influence from peers engaged in delinquent behavior, and increased influence from persons committed to conventional law abiding behavior — all of which are related to a reduction in delinquent behavior ranging from minor status offenses (truancy, minor theft) to index offenses listed in the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports. However, the ability of an LRE program to achieve these results is entirely contingent upon the sound systematic implementation of the educational experience in terms of the prescriptions listed above. In those classrooms without sound implementation, no change or slight increases in self-reported delinquent behavior may occur when the class is compared to control class students in the same schools. Of particular interest and importance is that our preliminary data indicate that LRE appears to have potential for favorable impact on students at all ability levels in the classroom as well as for young persons whose existing levels of delinquent behavior range from slight to substantial.

—Robert M. Hunter, Director, Center for Action Research and Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Colorado at Boulder and
Grant Johnson, Program Associate, Center for Action Research, Inc., 1981

More than 9 percent of jailed juveniles are 13 years old or younger.

—Youth Policy, *published by Youth Policy Institute. Washington, D.C., August 1981*

In summary: Violent crime and juvenile delinquency are in ascendency, and affect an increasing number of our citizens. Attempts to explain and fight crime have been only partially successful. The diminished influence of traditional institutions, and our failure to promote ethical standards suggest another explanation for crime — we are in jeopardy of becoming a value-less society. Audio visual media have partially replaced the family, church, school and community in conveying values to the oncoming generation, and appear to be inculcating transient, artificial and violent values. If this is the case, then possible avenues to pursue in the prevention and elimination of crime are: teach values in our schools; promote law related education to youth so they understand both the rights and the responsibilities of our constitutional government; increase activities reaching youth by an array of constructive organizations; guide children to quality media productions; increase the number of potential bonds or attachments that our citizens have with pro-social institutions; strengthen families and communities; and educate and constructively counsel delinquents. We

must, in short, revitalize and strengthen the moral and ethical foundation of our society.

—*Address by Mark W. Cannon, Administrative Assistant to the Chief Justice of the United States to 350 judges at the Southwestern Judicial Conference, June 4, 1981*

A study of the records of 500 juvenile delinquents in New York City found that 6 percent of the delinquents were responsible for 82 percent of the violent offenses committed by the whole group. A Honolulu study of 359 arrests in 1973 for violent offenses revealed that 19 percent of the persons arrested committed more than 80 percent of the offenses. In other jurisdictions, the statistics are less dramatic, but they consistently show that a large portion of the violent crimes are committed by a relatively small number of offenders.

—Phase I Recommendations, *Attorney General's Task Force on Violent Crime, June 17, 1981.*

1) *What proportion of all arrests do juveniles account for?*
About 23% in 1979. Young persons (aged 18-20) accounted for 17%, and adults (21 and older), 60%.
2) *What proportion of all arrests for serious and violent crimes do juveniles account for?*
In 1979, juveniles accounted for about *20%* of all violent crime arrests, 44% of all serious property crime arrests, and 39% of all serious crime arrests. Young persons accounted for *17% of all violent crime arrests;* 19%, serious property; and 18%, overall serious.
3) *What proportions of juvenile arrests are for serious and violent crimes?*
In 1979, about 4% of all juvenile arrests were for violent crimes, 35% for serious property crimes, and 39% for serious crimes overall. About 10% of all juvenile arrests for serious crimes were for violence; about 90% for serious property crimes. These data make it clear that *juveniles are disproportionately involved in serious crimes,* especially when one considers that in 1979, youths aged 10-17 represented about 14% of the total U.S. population.
4) *What proportion of each violent crime do juveniles account for?*
In 1979, juvenile arrests represented about 9% of all arrests for *murder,* 16% of all arrests for *robbery,* and 16% of all arrests for *aggravated assault.*
5) *What proportion of each serious property crime do juveniles account for?*
In 1979, juvenile arrests represented about 49% of all arrests for *arson,* 49% for *auto theft,* 49% for *burglary,* and 40% for *larceny.*
6) *What is the proportion of violent juvenile arrests for each such offense?*
In 1979, 2% of all violent juvenile arrests were for murder, 5% for rape, 47% for robbery, and 46% for aggravated assault.

An important category of serious and violent juvenile delinquency is *schools.* In 1976-77, the National Institute of Education surveyed a nationally representative sample of over 4,000 public elementary and secondary schools with respect to the incidence of disruptive, criminal and violent activities. The following were among the findings.

1) *The risk of violence to teenage youngsters is greater in school than elsewhere.* A remarkable 68% of the robberies and 50% of the assaults on youths aged 12-15 occur at school.
2) *Around 6,700 schools are seriously affected by crime.*
3) *An estimated 282,000 students are attacked at school in a typical one-month period* (42% of which involve some injury).
4) An estimated 112,000 students have something taken from them by force, weapons, or threats in a typical month.

—*Testimony of Charles A. Lauer, Acting Administrator, OJJDP, before Senate Judiciary Juvenile Justice Subcommittee, July 9, 1981*

Based on crimes reported in 1979, a serious crime occurred every 2.6 seconds; a theft occurred every 4.3 seconds; a burglary occurred every 10 seconds; a violent crime occurred every 27 seconds; a car or truck theft occurred every 29 seconds; an assault occurred every 51 seconds; a robbery occurred every 68 seconds; a forcible rape occurred every 7 minutes; and a murder occurred every 24 minutes.

—U.S. News & World Report
basic data: Federal Bureau of Investigation

Every year, almost one in three U.S. households is hit by a crime — a comprehensive category covering anything from a stolen wallet to a gang rape.

—Newsweek, *March 23, 1981*

Many people now are learning what criminologists have known for years: that the U.S. has the highest crime rates among Western industrialized nations. The rate of reported offenses is "three or four times" that of similar countries, says Graeme Newman, professor of criminal justice at the State University of New York at Albany.
The murder rate for the first half of the 1970s was 9 per 100,000 in the U.S. Meanwhile, the corresponding rate for Canada was 2.4, for the United Kingdom 1.0, and for Japan .2.

—Christian Science Monitor, *April 1, 1981*

While the rate of increase in violent crimes (murder, forcible rape, aggravated assault and robbery) has varied through the 1970s, the trend in crimes per 100,000 people has been relentlessly upward. The FBI's figures placed that rate in 1970 at 363.5; it was up to 535.5 in 1979, the last year in which the tabulation is complete. Of those four crimes, murder jumped to 9.7 per 100,000 in 1979.

—Time *magazine, March 23, 1981*

The cost of crime climbed to $890 million in property and currency stolen throughout New York State in 1979, while law-enforcement agencies cost more than $1.4 billion to operate.
The reported loss from crime was up nearly 25% in a year, according to the just-released annual report of the State Division of Criminal Justice Services. Of the loss, $149,490,771.00 was recovered. Forty-one percent of the thefts involved motor vehicles.

—New York Times, *Sunday, January 11, 1981*

New York . . . in 1980 had a record number of murders . . . . If the rate is unchanged, predicts an M.I.T. study, one out of every 61 babies born in the city last year can expect to die at the hands — or gun — of a killer.

—Time *magazine, March 23, 1981*

In 1980, crime rates exploded. New York, Los Angeles, Miami, and Dallas all showed record levels of murder, robbery, and burglary. Detroit, which had been calming down since 1976, reversed and showed increases in all major categories. And across the nation, the figures for the first six months of 1980 showed a 10 percent jump in serious crimes.

—Newsweek, *March 23, 1981*

Since so few burglars, rapists, and muggers are caught (only 20% of the FBI's 10 million reported crimes resulted in arrests last year), the profile of the criminal is hard to draw. Some basic facts are indisputable, however. Almost half of all arrests are of teenagers and young adults; indeed, 15 is the peak age for violent crimes. Forty-four percent of the nation's murderers are 25 or younger, and 10% are under 18. Of those arrested for street crimes, excluding murder, fully 75% are under 25 and 45% are under 18. A study done by Marvin E. Wolfgang, a sociologist and law professor at the University of Pennsylvania, showed that 627 out of 10,000 youths in Philadelphia became chronic offenders. They were responsible for two-thirds of the violent acts and 52% of all offenses committed by the group over an eight-year period.

—Time *magazine, June 30, 1975*

In 1979, the number of persons under 18 arrested was 2,143,369. This represents 22% of total arrests. While the number is considerably larger than 5 years earlier, the percentage of total arrests is significantly lower — from 27.2% in 1974 to 22% in 1979.

—*Testimony of David Bahlmann, Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America, before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, April, 1981.*

There are more young people between the ages of 18 and 24 in jails than there are in government programs for disadvantaged youths — and the National Juvenile Justice Assessment Center estimates crimes committed by this group cost society about $6 billion each year.

—*Testimony of Gary Lohn, Control Data Corporation, before the House of Representatives Education and Labor Committee, March, 1981.*

Developing public confidence in the legal profession and legal processes.

Crime and antisocial behavior represent a continuing crisis in American life. There is a parallel crisis in the lack of confidence most Americans exhibit toward our institutions and leaders. A 1973 Louis Harris poll concluded that a substantial majority of the American people were "alienated and disenchanted, feeling profoundly impotent to influence the actions of their leaders." Public confidence in most government institutions has declined "drastically," and is particularly low in regard to the courts, Congress, the federal executive branch and state and local government. These findings correspond with the depressingly low voter turnouts in recent elections. Turnouts of less than 50 percent of eligible voters are commonplace in state and local elections, and are barely over 50 percent for presidential elections.

—*American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship, 1981.*

Adolescents frequently see law as negative or repressive. What we have failed to do is to demonstrate the legal basis for the remarkable degree of freedom which we have maintained over a long period in this country, as well as the role of law in providing for the public good.
One of the most striking aspects of the education system in this country has been its failure to prepare students for the exercise of citizenship responsibilities. Ours is a constitutional democracy which strives to live by the rule of law. Yet we devote an insignificant part of the educational process to creating an appreciation for law and legal processes. For the most part, we let our youth learn about the law from negative experiences, such as a traffic violation, a drug charge, or a police officer's order to a group of youths to move on. Or we allow our youth to learn about the law through accounts of sensational cases, be they real or fictional, which appear in the headlines of our newspapers and which crowd our TV screens.
There appears to be a consensus among teachers and school administrators that children and young people do not perceive our legal system in the same way as do most adults. This should not come as a surprise, since the youthful social environment of adults varied considerably from that of today's youth. The value systems of our young people are not based upon the same traditional values, customs, or practices that were prevalent in the 30s,

40s, and 50s. Every technological advancement has had an important effect in shaping youthful perceptions. Parents and educators will generally agree that many of our children and youth "distort" or "misperceive" the functioning of our legal system. Unfortunately, too many youths think in a narrow, "TV way" about law. In short, we need to provide our children with a body of knowledge consistent with life as it is today, and which will replace those traditions, customs, and values we so carelessly discarded.

—*American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship, 1981.*

We all fear what we don't know. That's why so many of our young people are cynical about our legal system. For too many of them, the legal system means only hassles with authority, troubles ranging from brushes with the police to arrest and even jail.

Most juvenile crimes are committed by young people who feel that they lack meaningful alternatives. Perhaps as serious a challenge are those who don't appear in the statistics, but whose apathy, skepticism, and sense of powerlessness result in problems with our legal and governmental systems.

—Alternatives to Apathy,
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1980

Only 15 percent of Americans in a recent poll showed "a great deal" of confidence in the police's ability to protect the public from violent crime. Fully half reported little confidence or no confidence at all. Lack of confidence in courts was even more pronounced.

Only five percent had "a great deal" of confidence that courts would protect them, with 70 percent saying that they had little or no confidence in the courts.

—Newsweek, *March 23, 1981*

Appendix B

Your Letterhead

Mr. Jeffrey Fullpurse
Super Corporation
1000 Great Bucks Avenue
Anyplace, USA 00000

Dear Mr. Fullpurse:

State the request. Include amount, what it will be used for, and number of people who will benefit.

I have agreed to help the Anyplace law-related education project raise $2,000 to pay for buses to transport 350 local high school students to a mock trial competition to be held in November, 1982.

State the need for funds from a standpoint that will appeal to the prospective donor.

It is no exaggeration to say that this nation is currently facing a crisis of citizenship. Alienation, apathy, frustration, and even violence have increased markedly among our citizens. The indices of anti-social behavior, such as the crime rate, are rising steadily. At the same time, public confidence and citizen participation in government are declining. Many thoughtful observers have questioned whether a democracy can long endure in this atmosphere of mistrust and cynicism.

These statements are taken from Appendix A, Voting and Citizenship Information. They address this company's concern about a crisis in democracy, referred to in its annual report.

Meanwhile, public school courses in citizenship, historically designed to produce an informed and concerned citizenry, have come under increasing scrutiny and have all too often been found wanting. A number of scholarly studies have demonstrated that students are alienated both by the method of learning and by the content of traditional courses in civics and government.

Discuss how participants will benefit. These statements are taken from the Program Description.

The mock trial competition will provide the local students with a greater understanding not only of governmental process and criminal law, but of their general legal rights and responsibilities that affect all citizens every day. By participating in simulations of the litigation process, including pre-trial preparation, such students will acquire a basic familiarity with courtroom procedure and gain first-hand insight into some of the complexities of the judicial process and the difficulties encountered by its actors. Active involvement in the learning process will also reinforce learning about substantive areas of law at issue in the trial. Moreover, such students have opportunities to develop skills in critical thinking, oral advocacy, and written expression.

Make reference to organizations and individuals who believe the project is worthwhile. Mention by name those who will have a positive influence on the donor.

The mock trial competition is enthusiastically supported by _____, State Attorney General, and _____, Justice of the State Supreme Court. They will be actively participating as judges on the day of the mock trial.

Enclose a copy of the Program Description. Offer to provide more information if needed.

The mock trial competition is further described in the enclosed Program Description. Also enclosed is a detailed budget. Please call me if you need further information.

Specify a time when you will call for follow-up.

Thank you for your consideration. I will call you very soon to arrange an appointment to meet you and discuss the matter further.

Sincerely,

Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity, International

International Executive Board
Steve Clark, International Justice
Charles H. Taylor, International Vice Justice
Stanley H. Kohn, International Second Vice Justice
Homer S. Taft, International Advocate
Jack Miller, International Secretary
Larry Crigler, International Treasurer
Hon. James M. Bierce, International Historian
Fredric H. Pearson, International Marshal
Norman M. Owen, International Proctor

Juvenile Justice Advisory Council
Donald S. Dawson, Washington, D.C.
Emlyn I. Griffith, Rome, New York
David J. McCarthy, Washington, D.C.
Alice O'Donnell, Washington, D.C.
Hon. John C. Tracey, Rockville, Maryland
Jennifer Brown, Baltimore, Maryland
Denice Dandridge, Washington, D.C., Student

Juvenile Justice Program Staff
Robert E. Redding, Director
Norman Scott, Deputy Director
David M. Schimmel, Education Consultant
Joan Flaherty, Management Assistant
Kathleen Desmond, Management Assistant